

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF HOMŒOPATHY.

The Agitation of Thought is the Beginning of Truth.

VOL. 8.

NEW-YORK, NOVEMBER, 1853.

NO. 7.

S. R. KIRBY, M.D., EDITOR.

Medical Diary of an Invalid Gentleman,
during a Recent Visit to Cheltenham.

To the Editor of the Homœopathic Times.

SIR,—I hope you will insert the following, as I believe such narratives are well calculated to advance the cause of Homœopathy. My original idea was to have published it in the *Times*, but on stating my intention to my valued friend Dr. H—, of Cheltenham, he objected to it. I then observed to him that "I had two powerful reasons for wishing to publish my case: the first was a vehement desire to recommend to my suffering fellow-creatures a system of medicine which had done so much for me; and secondly, I considered it only an act of justice to you, as the public and noble avowal of Homœopathy which you have made has caused you many enemies among a certain class in Cheltenham, and brought upon you much persecution." To which Dr. H— replied, "These," said he, "being your ideas, I can have no objection to you publishing your case in the *Times*, provided you do not use my name, the omission of which will not at all militate against your philanthropic intentions of recommending rational medicine *versus* drugs to the public; and as regards my being persecuted by druggists and allopathic doctors for practising that system of medicine which I consider best for my patients, and choosing

"To throw physic to the dogs,"

and thus step aside from the routine system of drug medication, after being thoroughly satisfied that its operative principles of bleeding, blistering, purging, mercurialization, etc., with all their attendant and subsequent horrors, were wrong in both theory and practice, I, of course, calculated the cost, and knew that my fate would necessarily be that of all reformers, whether in theology, politics, science, or medicine, i. e., persecution from those whose interests the reformation was likely to affect, and therefore I expected to lose the good opinion and interest of druggists, etc., and am not at all surprised at their opposition to me, as my principles of practice are as

destructive to their 'craft' as the preaching of Christianity was to the artisans and worshippers of the 'great goddess Diana,' the promulgation of teetotalism to spirit distillers and venders, or steam-engines to stage-coaches.

"Why, sir, I would rather have five patients and an approving conscience, testifying that I was treating them on rational and scientific principles, than be engaged from morning till night in drawing away the life-blood of my suffering fellow-creatures, and dosing them with physic, of whose effects I was as ignorant as the 'man in the moon.' Having therefore this *mens conscia recti*, I care not one fig what druggists, etc., may choose to say about me, more especially as my every-day experience shows me that Homœopathy is more effectual in disease than legitimate drugging."

Such was the philosophical reply of the Doctor, and I must say that I left him grieved that he would not allow me to use his name. However, as I had determined to publish my case *pro bono publico*, without Dr. H—'s name, I mentioned my intentions to a friend of mine, at the same time expressing my regret that the Doctor would not allow me to use his name. He suggested that the Doctor's objection might be to having his name mentioned in connection with my case in a non-medical paper, but said, he might have no objection to permit its use in a medical journal. Capital idea, thought I; so I at once resolved to publish it in your paper, and take my chance of offending the Doctor by using his name.

I have considered this introduction necessary, in order that my readers may see my real intentions, etc., in publishing my case.

Dear reader, consider yourself as talking to a man about forty-five years of age, and bear with me patiently whilst I tell you a bit of my life. Well, then, when young and at the University, I was a gay and dashing Cantab; in fact, what is generally styled "a fast man," addicted to pleasures of questionable propriety, the results of which had, at the early age of thirty-five years, made great incursions upon and havoc with

my system. At this age, had you seen me, you would have beheld a lean, tall gentleman, whose countenance was indicative of much mental and physical suffering, whose aspect was melancholy, whose voice was weak, whose limbs were infirm, whose hands trembled and shook, and whose skin was covered with a loathsome eruption. But, ah! what were these outward appearances to the mental and physical tortures which I suffered inwardly? My mind was continually racked with retrospective follies and prospective sufferings. The society of friends was irksome. My feelings were—Leave me alone to brood over my sad state; don't talk to me of blue skies and balmy breezes, etc., etc., whilst such a canker-worm corrodes my very vitals. But why need I harrow my reader's feelings with a recital of my *thousand and one* sufferings? suffice it to say, I was a complete martyr to dyspepsia, liver, kidney, and skin diseases.

Well, then, at this age and in this state, I repaired to London to consult Dr. Chambers. He, seeing the shattered state of my constitution, prescribed travelling, etc. I went to the Continent, was there for some time, took Dr. Chambers's medicine regularly, but came home no better. I saw Dr. Chambers again; went on with his medicine for a long time, but deriving no benefit, I consulted Dr. Watson, and after being under him for months did not find myself any better. After this I consulted several other medical men, among whom was Sir B. Brodie; was recommended to try the Cheltenham waters, and for this purpose I came to Cheltenham.

May 1st, 1853. Up to this period, being about three years since I consulted Dr. Chambers, I find I have received 201 recipes from different medical men, no two of them agreeing in their contents—I know sufficient of doctors' prescriptions to ascertain this;—have had twelve dozen leeches and twenty blisters applied; swallowed some hogsheds of mineral waters, and gallons of nasty physic; been salivated several times, and have therefore nearly had all my teeth destroyed, besides paying a good round sum for all this mischief; but this I don't regret, as I believe my doctors did all they could for me.

3rd. Arrived in Cheltenham; much fatigued by the journey, and retired early to bed.

4th. Very weak and poorly; bad night: can eat no breakfast; tongue parched; horrid irritation of the skin; must have some advice about the waters here to-day.

5th. This is a lovely town, had I only health to enjoy it. Bought to-day a little book on "The Use and Abuse of the Cheltenham Waters," by Dr. H—, a resident. Read it, and think of consulting him about the waters.

6th. Very poorly all day. Went to a

druggist's in the evening to have a recipe compounded; asked him some questions about Cheltenham waters and Dr. H—; he spoke very disparagingly of Dr. H—; said he was a "quack." "Quack," said I, "why, I perceive from his book on the Cheltenham waters that he is a fully qualified medical man." "Yes," said he, "I believe he is; but, sir, he is a homœopathist." Oh! thought I, that's where the shoe pinches. Now, as I was a total stranger in Cheltenham, and anxious to have some resident medical man's opinion before I commenced the mineral waters in my precarious state, and admiring the little book of Dr. H— thereon, I thought I would make some further inquiries about him, to ascertain whether my suspicions were correct as to how it was that the druggist spoke against him, so I made some trifling purchases in two or three chemists' shops, and found them also adverse to both the "waters" and Dr. H—.

Mem. Don't wonder at it, as Dr. H— hits off the drugging system admirably in his book on the "Use and Abuse of Cheltenham Waters," which was written, as he has since informed me, when he practised as an allopath. But any one reading it with ordinary attention, could not miss seeing that the Doctor would not long dose his patients with drugs.

7th. Did not get up until midday, took medicine last night; very poorly all day. Will consult Dr. H— to-morrow about the "waters." Great pains in sides and ancles, and can scarcely walk.

8th. Called on Dr. H—; found him a most pleasant and agreeable man, and one that appears to take a deep interest in his patients. I told him I came to consult him, as I thought of taking the Cheltenham waters, being recommended here for that purpose. He then went into my case most thoroughly; wrote down every circumstance connected with it, as I narrated it to him, and after I had done, he began and questioned me most minutely, like an opposite counsel, upon the depositions I had given him. An hour and a half was fully occupied by him in exploring both my whole *corpus* and case. He then asked to see the prescriptions I had been using.

Mem. If that is the man the druggists call a "quack," I wish there were more of them. Never, in all my experience, did I get such a poking and probing to find out all about my case as from him. Be his principles what they may, he is certainly anxious to benefit his patients.

9th. Called on Dr. H—, and gave him prescriptions. "Sir," said he, "allow me time to look over these, and call again to-morrow." "Certainly," said I.

10th. Called again on the Doctor according to appointment, but never shall I forget his salutation. "Sir," said he, "I have looked over this bundle of heterogeneous

rubbish," holding up my highly-valued recipes, for at this period I knew nothing of Homœopathy, "and I am truly astonished that they have not killed you." I stared. "Nay, sir," said he, "don't me amazed, hear me; why, sir, do you know you have taken* — ounces of mercury, — drachms of iodine, — scruples of corrosive sublimate." "Pray, Doctor, stop; you make me quite nervous." But, sir, I hav'n't half done, for besides these—" "Pray, Doctor

—I beg your pardon for interrupting you—but what was I to do? they were all ordered for me by first-class doctors." "Precisely so," said he; "men who stand high in society and high in their profession, and to whose dicta the sick public bow, yet nevertheless, irrespective of their high social position and many excellent qualities and attainments as anatomists, chemists, botanists, physiologists, pathologists, they are terribly ignorant in therapeutics, or the true art of healing disease. Sir, don't be astonished when I tell you that not one of all these physicians who have written prescriptions have either proved or know the real effects of any one of the most simple or deleterious ingredients therein ordered, and this being the case, how is it possible that they can have any correct ideas of their actions upon the sick, in this compounded and heterogeneous form? Truly, Dr. Paris may exclaim, that 'the ingredients of each prescription were fighting together in the dark.' If they had by repeated experiments first ascertained the effects of these several drugs upon the system of the healthy man, they would have refrained from mixing them, knowing well that this would confuse their several properties, and render them null; but lacking this highly necessary knowledge, they have jumbled a lot of them together, hoping that if one miss the mark, the other may hit. And besides, were they as skilled in the properties of drugs as they are in the other collateral branches of medical science, they would also have refrained from giving you drugs in this crude and material state, as they would then have known that the spiritual or dynamic portion of all drugs contain their real curative principles, and would no more have thought of giving you mercury, iodine, etc., in their crude state, than a publican would think of giving his customer a quart of barley when he asks for a glass of whiskey."

"But, Doctor," said I, "have any doctors proved medicine in this way you speak of?" "My dear sir," said he, "look at these six volumes," pointing to six goodly well-fingered volumes lying before him on his study-table; these contain the provings of about three hundred different medicines." "Indeed," exclaimed I, in perfect

* I forbear mentioning the quantities, as it really makes me shake to think that I was made such a mercury mine.

amazement, "and pray, Doctor, do you only give one medicine at a time, of whose effects you are cognizant?" "Precisely so," said he, "as I have just told you, and proved. Our remedies are all tried and proved ones, and therefore we know the precise parts of the body upon which they act, and administer them accordingly; whereas allopaths mix a lot together, of whose single and combined effects they are comparatively ignorant, as observed before, just like an amateur sportsman, who neither knows his gun nor the strength of his powder, and who is therefore obliged to put in a whole listful of shot hoping that some one pellet may do execution; whereas the real sportsman, who has both proved his rifle and powder, chucks in one pellet, lets fly and bags his game." "I see," said I, delighted at the forcible logic of the Doctor. "And pray, Doctor, is this what they call Homœopathy?" "No, sir," said he, "this is the practical part of Homœopathy; but Homœopathy means that diseases are cured by medicines which are known to produce a *similar* state in the healthy man, hence the phrase *similia similibus curantur*." "I see then, Doctor, to cure me you would give me the spiritual part of a medicine that would produce a liver, etc. disease." "Not exactly, as that would be Isopathy or *same* disease; I would give you a medicine capable of producing in a healthy man a state *similar* to that in which you are now in." "Excuse me, Doctor, for troubling you so, but you have vastly interested me in Homœopathy—would not this medicine make me worse?" "It would," replied the Doctor, "if taken in large doses; but to prevent that we give our medicines in infinitesimal doses, just sufficient to overcome the abnormal action, without increasing it." "Well, Doctor, I don't exactly comprehend you; but, however, you have told me so much about my state, etc., that I am now very anxious to know whether you think the Cheltenham waters will suit me."

"No," said he, "neither the Cheltenham waters nor any other mineral waters will suit you, and simply for this reason, namely, symptoms of general dropsy are exhibiting themselves, and this being the case, mineral waters would only aggravate those diseases which are giving origin to this deposition of water, or dropsy. Besides, you have already taken too much mineral waters; had you taken less of them and less of medicine, you would not have had so many pains and aches about you." I was now beginning to think that the Doctor was right; but I was very anxious to get well, and did not see how I could attain that without the use of drugs, so I asked him what he would advise me to do. "You have," said he, "now used drugs for three years, and tried mineral waters without any benefit at all, so it is time for you to

think of trying something else, and what I would advise you is to give Homœopathy, combined with a little Hydropathy, a fair trial, as I firmly believe that a judicious combination of these will effect more for you than all the drugs and mineral waters in Christendom; and though, mind you, I do not positively say that they will *cure* you, I do most firmly assert that they will render your life more bearable, and free you from your present state of suffering." "Enough," said I; "I am, Doctor, entirely in your hands." He then wrote out for me a diet-table, specifying the hours of my meals, and what I was to have at each, lopping off many things which I had been in the habit of taking, and permitting the use of others which had been prohibited by other doctors. I, however, saw that his object was, as he said, "to nourish me without unduly stimulating my system." He also gave me six little powders, one of which I was to take night and morning, dissolved in a spoonful of water.

Mem. I now see clearly how it is that the druggists don't like the Doctor, as he does not choose, as he forcibly expresses it, "to make a chemist's shop of a patient's stomach." If the practical results of Homœopathy be as good as his ideas of medicine appear to be correct, what a blessing Homœopathy will be to mankind.

11th. Took my powder last night and this morning. They have neither taste nor smell—pleasant medicine, at all events; though don't think such tiny little powders can do much good.

13. Have taken my six powders, and think I am decidedly better; at all events my spirits are more cheerful, appetite better, and sleep more refreshing. Called upon the Doctor, had a long *tête-à-tête* with him; he also considers me improving. To go on with powders only at night, and to wear a wet-compress over my stomach.

Mem. Queer thing this Homœopathy, though the Doctor seems to have great confidence in it. I must say I have no great faith in it, yet I feel better than I have done for a long time. Great faith in the Doctor.

17. Feel remarkably queer to-day, am all out of sorts; could fight with a cat; and, what is worse, all my pains and aches are increased. Confound this Homœopathy! I am sure it won't suit me. Called upon the Doctor in a very irritable mood; told him he was making me worse instead of better. "How?" said he. "Why," said I, "all my pains, etc., are increased." "Are you sure of that?" said he. "Quite positive," said I. He smiled and said, "I am very glad to hear it," (confound the fellow! thought I, if this be his sympathy, I don't much admire it,) "as it shows you, sir, that I have not been aiming at the moon and hitting one of the stars; in other words, I have been storming the enemy in the

camp." "You have," said I, "and that, too, with a vengeance!" "Well, never mind, it's all right." I thought it was all wrong. "It's all for your good," said he, and he then commenced to catechise me most minutely about all my pains and feelings, both mentally and bodily, and ended by saying, "All right, sir, perfectly right, sir; go out every day for two hours, from eleven o'clock till one o'clock, in an open fly; go on with the same diet, and call on me in two days." "But, Doctor, won't you give some medicine? I have taken all the powders." "Not a particle," said he, "until I again see you, when I hope to find you better."

19th. Very much better this morning; pains and aches nearly all gone. Called upon the Doctor. "Hope you feel better?" said he. "Oh, yes," said I, "very much." "Glad to hear it," said he; "you thought, I suppose, the medicine was going to kill you; but the fact of the matter is, sir, it was only a slight aggravation of your disease, produced by having taken a dose or two of the medicine too much; all good for you in the end." "But, Doctor, do you really think it was the medicine? is it possible for such tasteless, tiny powders to take such effects upon one?" "Do I think it was the medicine, and is it possible for such tasteless, etc.? Why, sir, you almost insult me by such questions. Have you not experienced it, and is not that enough? Besides, don't you see that by leaving off the medicine your pains gradually gave way, and you are now much better?" "I ask pardon, Doctor; the thing is so new and strange to me altogether that I don't know what to think of it." "Your pardon is granted, sir; and I am more pleased than otherwise when intelligent patients make such remarks, as it gives me an opportunity of explaining to them how such incredulity arises, and also the injury those 'tiny powders' are capable of doing in the hands of ignorant persons. Your incredulity arises thus: hitherto you have been treated by materialists, *i. e.*, doctors who fancy that medicine can do no good unless it be prescribed in large and crude doses, and hence you have swallowed pills by the dozen, and mixtures by the gallon, with what result your own experience can testify; therefore you conclude that *infinitesimal* doses of medicine can do no good. But, sir, to draw deductions from comparisons is not always correct logic. For instance, you may eat a great deal of barley when boiled, in its crude state, without any other feeling than that of satiety, but only let the same quantity of barley be submitted to the process of distillation, so as to set free the spiritual principle which lies latent in it, and then a very small portion of that spirit, when dissolved in water, will produce intoxication; so that you see, because the barley in its crude state had not this

effect, it is erroneous to conclude that it does not possess this principle of intoxication.

"Thus it is with medicine, as it is only in the dynamic or spiritual principle that the curative properties reside, and to develop this, homœopaths submit their medicines to processes of *trituration* and *succussion*, which processes act a similar part in medicine to that of distillation in barley, and in this concentrated and dynamic form we administer our remedies in infinitesimal doses. Besides, sir, it is a well-established fact that when a medicine is administered homœopathic to the disease, a very small dose is sufficient, as the diseased part is very susceptible to kindred influences, which medicine, when truly homœopathic, possesses; in the same way, for instance, as a very small degree of heat will painfully affect a *burned* finger.

"Now, as regards the injury which infinitesimal doses of medicine thus prepared can effect in the hands of ignorant persons, I observe that, owing to the idea prevalent in the minds of the public that these globules can do no harm, it has become a custom with some to furnish themselves with a case of homœopathic globules and a "*Domestic Practice of Homœopathy*," and thus armed, begin doctoring themselves in what they consider trivial complaints. Well, according to these blind guides, *i. e.*, "*Domestic Homœopathy*," they go to work, and take globules as therein prescribed for what they may consider their disease. But, after taking a few doses, they either find themselves better or no better, or perhaps have all their feelings much aggravated, as you experienced a few days ago, or find that all their symptoms have undergone a complete change.

"Now, in these dilemmas what do they do? Why, if they are not benefited by the medicines, they keep on repeating the dose until one of the two consequences ensue, namely, their state is aggravated, or their feelings so confused that they can scarcely tell how they feel. Now, not being able to judge whether the aggravation is produced by the medicine or by the disease, as the hints given in these '*domestic*' books on this subject are anything but sufficient to enable any one to know the difference, they either repeat the same medicine or fly to another, and thus go on until they have their symptoms, that is, those of the disease and those of the medicine, so confused and jumbled together, that their state would puzzle the most acute pathologist, and themselves placed in that most uncomfortable position of neither '*feeling really well nor really ill*.' I know," said the Doctor, "several of these non-professional amateur homœopaths who are precisely in this condition, and I long to tell them of it, but if I did, I well know what they would think, though they might not express it.

'Very fine,' they would say; 'the Doctor does not like our lay practice, he wants us to become his patients.' That is precisely how my remarks would be construed," said he, "therefore I am obliged to be quiet, and inwardly lament the destruction these people are making with their own and others' health in this quiet manner. I am convinced that they would do themselves infinitely less injury by doctoring themselves, etc., according to the directions of allopathic '*domestic*' books, because they would neither be so ready to swallow their nauseous compounds nor continue taking them so long as they play at swallowing globules.

"Now, sir, had I either repeated your medicine or changed it the last day I saw you, I should either have increased your suffering, or made you the unhappy mortal of a confused mixture of medicinal and morbid pains, and thus perhaps frightened you from going on with Homœopathy. Many, many disciples, I fear, are thus lost to our new and beautiful system, even by doctors giving them too much medicine; for, rest assured, until a doctor practises Homœopathy for some time with the eye of a lynx and the observation of a Euclid, he will be more or less a materialist, and be disposed to give medicine in frequent and repeated doses."

I was highly delighted with the Doctor's philosophy and logic on this deeply sanitary and interesting topic, and left determined in my own mind that let who like "play at globules," I would not, as I was beginning to consider them sharpened instruments. I am to go on for a day or two without any medicine.

24th. Better in every respect; to continue same medicine. Had a good walk to-day.

26th. From this date until the middle of July, making about two months and a half since I consulted Dr. H—, I progressed favorable; regained my strength very considerably; lost all my hippish feelings; eruption on the skin and the swelling of my legs disappeared. I could now enjoy my food much and walk many miles without fatigue. Indeed, I was so much recovered, that I left my valued doctor and Cheltenham, in high spirits, to resume my duty. Not that I was quite well, but that I was so far recovered that with care I felt I could get along tolerably well. On parting with the Doctor, he gave me some of his wonderful tasteless—though to me magic—medicine, telling me how to use it, and if I did not go on well, to write to him.

September 1st. Feel as merry as a kitten and as light as a bee. Had only occasion to write to the Doctor twice since I parted with him. My friends are all amazed and delighted with the effect Homœopathy has had upon me. As for my own feelings, I

can only say that if I had it in my power, I would have every soul, from the Queen to the pauper, treated, when ill, homœopathically. How is it that our leading physicians and hospital doctors do not practice it? Is it prejudice keeps them from practicing it, or is it because they either don't know or won't know anything about it? Surely, they are bound to investigate it, as the system which they practice is anything but perfect. This is admitted by them. Sir A. Cooper says that "the science of medicine was founded on conjecture, and improved by murder." Dr. Gregory says that "medical doctrines are little better than stark-staring absurdities." Dr. G. Bird says that "medical science is by no means perfect or exact." This, then, being the opinion of the great lights of Allopathy about their own system, how, in the name of common sense, is it that they don't examine into the doctrines of Homœopathy, which appear to me to be based upon scientific principles? If Professor Simpson, and all those scribbles who write against it without first studying its principles, would only throw off their prejudice and thoroughly and impartially investigate Homœopathy what blessing to suffering humanity would accrue. Had I, for instance, been treated homœopathically, from the first, I should now, at all events, have had my *teeth*, which, I regret to say, are nearly all destroyed by the mercury I have taken. Seriously, the subject of Homœopathy is one of vital importance, and, for my own part, I consider it next only to that of salvation itself. Oh! were I only a medical man, not all the druggists and physicians in England would prevent me from proclaiming its doctrines and practicing its glorious principles, and herein is where I vastly admire the noble spirit of my dear bodily saviour, Dr. H—, as he had the hardihood, not to say moral courage, to embrace and practice it when convinced of its correctness, at the imminent risk of losing all his practice; for, be it observed, when he declared himself a homœopathist, he had only just purchased a practice which had been conducted by an allopath for twenty years. Nor did he ever once attempt, as I am credibly informed, to practice it, as many do, *sub rosa*, but, like a true man who had first thoroughly satisfied his mind that Allopathy was wrong in theory and practice, and Homœopathy correct in both, he declared his intention publicly to practice the latter, not fearing but that its results in disease would testify the truthfulness of his principles. And more than this, I know for a fact that he even refused to attend many of his predecessor's best patients as an allopath, and consequently lost them as patients. But I am satisfied that the loss was more *theirs*, and not *his*. It is probable that I have said more than will be agreeable to the Doctor's feelings;

but I considered it was only my duty to make these remarks, as I am the recipient of the blessings of those principles the adoption and advocacy of which have cost my friend Dr. H— much persecution.

I calmly and dispassionately tell the public, for whom I write, that they ought to consider the man or woman who speaks against Homœopathy and its professors as an enemy to their dearest blessing, health. I may perhaps be considered as using warm language, and recommending Homœopathy very sanguinely. I know it, and plead guilty; but cold and callous indeed must the heart of him be who could do otherwise, after receiving such benefit as I have from it. I had almost despaired of ever being restored to tolerable health, and thought that I was inevitably doomed to a premature grave; but I thank God that I was directed to Cheltenham, where I met with Dr. H— in a very curious but to me providential manner, and that he has been instrumental in effecting so much good for me.

Oh! dear reader, if you only knew the torments which I suffered for three years, and the ease of both body and mind which I now experience, you would forgive my warm advocacy of Homœopathy and my esteem of Dr. H—; more especially did you feel, as I now do, for the wretched condition of those thousands of my suffering fellow-creatures who are at this very moment prostrate on beds of languishing, in hospitals, homes, etc., and who are subjects to the combined tortures of disease and drugs, not knowing that all their suffering might be more speedily alleviated by the tasteless though potent homœopathic medicine. You, too, would feel your pulse throb with sympathy, and could perhaps no more remain quiet than I in recommending most sincerely to these afflicted creatures such a gentle and efficacious system of medicine.

One word on the economy of Homœopathy, and I have done. For the three years that I was under allopathic treatment, I find that I paid £164 in fees to medical men, and my druggists' bills, during the same period, cost me £57 3s., making in all £221 3s. Now contrast this with my charges for the three months that I was under Dr. H—. His bill for both medicine and attendance during that period was only £10! so that I was cured for the *one twenty-second* part of the sum paid to doctors and druggists, and in *one-twelfth* part of the time. And besides all this economy of cash, look at the horrible sufferings that I endured during these three years of allopathic barbarities, and which I should have been spared had I, *at the first*, been so fortunate as to have consulted Dr. H—. Had I done this, not only would I have *economized my money*, but I would also have *economized my health*, which is

a thousand times more precious; for although I am now comparatively well, the immense quantity of drugs which I have taken, together with the protracted bodily and mental sufferings which I endured for those three years, have taken such hold upon my system and so enfeebled it, that I fear I can never expect to enjoy robust health.

I am, however, heartily thankful for the benefit which I have received from Homœopathy, and my parting advice to all invalids and sick people is—*Fly, dear friends, from the cruel slavery of allopathic drugging, cross the narrow stream of ice-bound prejudice and custom which separates this land of torture from the smiling plains and delightful country of homœopathy, wherein drug slavery is unknown; where the law of bloodshed is abrogated, and where the cruel Legree cat-and-nine-tails of maza, burning irons, and cupping are proscribed by the gentle and rational laws of Homœopathy.* Be like Eliza, in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," take your children and fly from your persecutors, and be no more slaves to unnatural laws, with all their attendant and subjugant horrors.

In fine, recollect that this my parting advice is that of an emancipated drug-slave, now rejoicing in his freedom, and who now feels anxious that all slaves to allopathy should enjoy the immunities of homœopathy.

I have now done; my conscience is clear, in that I have recommended to all suffering and tempest-tost mortals that which I verily believe to be the "gospel of medical salvation," and a peaceful haven wherein, when storms of affliction rage and roar, they may find a sure and agreeable anchorage.—*Hom. Times.*

The British Institute of Homœopathy.

To the Editor of the *Homœopathic Times*.

SIR,—The large majority of the homœopathic profession having evinced, by their answers announced at the "Congress" held at Manchester in August last, their sense of the necessity of a professional council, the undersigned have been led to confer and agree upon the formation of an analogous but more comprehensive scheme, which will embrace all the objects to be aimed at by the appointment of a council as proposed by Dr. Fearon, and at the same time secure to the public and the profession a much-needed guarantee that its members are in reality true followers of Hahnemann, and individually pledged to carry out the principles and practice of homœopathy in all their integrity.

To effect so desirable an object it is essential that the "Institute" should be

based upon sound principles, such as are only to be found clearly defined in our homœopathic text-book—the *Organon* of Hahnemann; and here we wish it to be understood that we only allude to those practical aphorisms which have been tested and confirmed by experience. We have no concern with any speculative theories of Hahnemann, who frankly tells us that such ought to have no influence over his practical precepts and facts.

Every well-educated practitioner who rightly appreciates the spirit of Hahnemann's doctrines and practice, must grieve to read the reports of proceedings and the inculcation of doctrines as widely removed from true homœopathic science and art as the poles are distant from each other. Mr. Sampson has truly written in his "Progress of Homœopathy," "it is all very well to get hold of a principle, but it is also necessary to get hold of the right way of applying it."

We are confident, then, that every true follower of Hahnemann must feel as anxious as ourselves to have an "Institute," based upon sound fundamental principles, around which alone the disciples of Hahnemann can expect to rally in union and harmony.

We deem it to be all-important that the leading aphorisms of Hahnemann's *Organon* should be clearly and distinctly stated, subscribed to, and acted upon in practice by every one who calls himself a homœopathic practitioner; for until such agreement be accomplished, all substantial progress in true homœopathy, as well as the settlement of existing differences on essential points of practice, must be retarded.

The birth-place of our science, Germany itself, was, no less than our own country is at present, overrun with spurious practice and innovations that well-nigh threatened the ruin of true Homœopathy, until the more rigid class of its adherents there stepped forward to stem the injurious torrent of that crude compound practice known under the euphonious name of "Specificism." Dr. Wolf, of Dresden, was selected to draw up certain fundamental "theses," which were to be acknowledged by all who wished to be considered homœopaths. These "theses" were discussed and adopted at a meeting of the "Central Homœopathic Society." The effort, though rather tardy in its operation, was successful in its results, and saved Homœopathy in Germany.

Now, Sir, it must deeply grieve all who wish to be faithful disciples, to know that amongst the professional homœopaths in this country, some course of action like unto that undertaken by Dr. Wolf and others, in Germany, in 1836, is urgently demanded if we would secure the advancement of true Homœopathy in Great Britain. If that

crude routine practice and fanciful speculation which are now so prevalent be not checked, they cannot fail ere long thoroughly to vitiate our refined doctrines, and alienate from us the intelligent portion of the public possibly for many many long years. While we are of opinion that some of the allopathic school, to which we ourselves belonged, have shown a bitterness of feeling to us and to the doctrines of Hahnemann, quite unjustifiable either upon scientific or philanthropic grounds, we conceive that no act of ours, as homœopaths, should be tinged with suspicious or doubtful proceedings that can stain the purity or darken the lustre of our scientific art. Truly has it been observed by Dr. Dake, in reference to pseudo-homœopaths who pursue the mixed practice, which we, as homœopaths, repudiate as untenable in connection with the homœopathic law:—"The want of consistency apparent in all such mongrel practice, while it increases the prejudices of the ignorant, and disgusts the learned, can but expose our system to ridicule and final neglect. A community once thus imposed upon, will be slow, *very* slow, in placing confidence in the true homœopathist who may in after years settle in their midst. Better, far better, that another half century pass before the knowledge of our healing art becomes universal, than that that art should in five years be known from the rising to the setting sun, and known in such a manner as in five years more to ensure its long sleep in the grave, where all the exploded humbugs of the past are sleeping. Great would be the gain to our cause, and great to suffering humanity, were such conceited practitioners yet more like angel's visits—few and far between."

The following law, principles, and rules contain, in our opinion, what is essential in the homœopathic system of medicine, and necessary in its correct application for the cure of disease. They may be considered to furnish that rallying-ground which is wanted, and they ought to be subscribed to, by whosoever wishes to become a member of the Institute. We hold—

1. That the law *similia similibus* is the only law which is as yet known for the cure of disease through medicinal agency.

Observation.—Although this law is the foundation of the homœopathic system, it is not, as has often been asserted, the system itself. The systematic application of the law to the cure of disease necessitates the observance of certain rules proved by experience to be most advantageous in the actual treatment of disease, and also for the development of certain principles implied, of which we consider the following to be essential.

2: The investigation of the pathogenetic

properties of medicines through trial on the healthy body.

Observation.—On this point we hold that experience has sufficiently shown that medicines prepared according to the formulae published by Hahnemann himself, are preferable for that purpose to the crude primitive substance; and we further hold that a knowledge of medicinal symptoms, arising during the treatment of disease, cannot be registered as *pure* pathogenetic effects to be safely relied upon for future guidance in the selection of the remedy, and ought to be strictly separated from those observed on the body in health.

3. The exhibition of only one medicine at a time.

Observation.—On this subject we hold that giving medicines alternately as a rule and not as an exception, which can happen but very rarely in the present state of our *Materia Medica*, and without having previously ascertained the effects of the dose or doses of the medicine last taken by the patient, is inadmissible in rational and scientific practice. It is merely a crude expedient, not based upon any scientific principle, and is calculated to produce uncertainty and confusion, and to preclude all chance of advancing our system through pure clinical observations. This applies *à fortiori*, to the irrational administration of three medicines "alternately," and to what has been called "courses" of homœopathic medicines. Hahnemann writes—

"If the physician alternates his remedies in rapid succession, this is a sure sign that he has not chosen his remedies with strict reference to their homœopathic action, or has but carelessly studied the existing series of symptoms."

4. The use of medicines prepared as Hahnemann directs, and those in "small" doses.

Observation.—Whatever may be the opinion of different homœopaths on the subject of "potency," and of doses, they all agree that medicines prepared as Hahnemann directs are infinitely superior to those given in their crude state, and we are therefore justified in exacting the above principle as an essential part of the homœopathic system. As to dose and "potency" they must for the present, in a great measure, remain an open question; but leaning on our own experience, and that of Hahnemann and his best disciples in different countries, we hold that (as a rule) globule-doses from the third preparation upwards, according to the character of the remedy, the disease, and the circumstances, are sufficient for curative purposes, *if the medicine be properly chosen*, and that preparations scarcely removed from the crude substance, as well as grains and drops, and other expedients to increase the bulk of the dose, are (as a rule) not only unnecessary, but offer greater risk of aggravating the disorder,

creating confusion, and doing more mischief than "higher" preparations and "smaller" doses.

Besides the great law and the principles derived from it, as stated above, we hold the observance of the following rules to be necessary for the successful application of both :

5. The close examination of the case, not only as to the *status præsens* but also as to anamnesis, and hereditary and other predispositions. These together form the totality, the symptoms present constitute only one part of the disease.

Observation.—To assert that Hahnemann teaches that the mere symptoms present are a sufficient criterion for the choice of the medicine, is to misapprehend the formal text of the *Organon* and the spirit of the homœopathic doctrine.

6. The writing down the entire case.

Observation.—As in correct homœopathic treatment, much turns upon the close individualization of the disease and the remedy during the whole course of treatment, it is obvious that no homœopath of any practice could possibly keep in his memory all the minute details which a great variety of patients present, and which are often highly characteristic and decisive for the choice of the medicine. We therefore hold this point to be all-important in actual practice, and its neglect inseparable from confusion, uncertainty, and injury to the interests of the patient.

7. The close research in the books on *Materia Medica* for the correct choice of the medicine.

Observation.—We hold that there are very few cases, and none of any importance, in which this rule can be dispensed with. Anybody the least acquainted with the exigencies of correct homœopathic practice knows that it is a most difficult thing to find out an appropriate medicine, considering that we have to choose from among two hundred thousand pathogenetic effects (at the lowest computation) of 360 medicines, which no mortal memory could ever retain, and every one of which may, in certain cases, be of importance and decisive. Unless this rule be observed, homœopathic practice must necessarily degenerate into crude and injurious routine. The observance of the three foregoing rules is certainly connected with a considerable expenditure of time, yet they cannot be neglected without injury to the patient, to homœopathy, and to the practitioner himself. That they can be strictly observed, even in a considerable practice, the example of Hahnemann and that of his best disciples proves. Proper husbanding of time goes far in facilitating the task.

8. With regard to the question of (to use the received term) "allopathic auxiliaries," that is, having recourse during homœopathic treatment to bleeding, leech-

ing, blistering, emetising, purging, cauterising, narcotising, medicinal external applications, and other similar contrivances of the ordinary school, which have been of late seriously recommended by a certain number of homœopaths, we hold that they are not only not necessary for curative purposes, but highly injurious to the true interest of the patient, and that homœopathy offers, in correctly-chosen remedies, more efficacious and less injurious palliatives in incurable cases than those mentioned above. The admission of these auxiliaries would imply the insufficiency of Homœopathy, which we deny. Neither Hahnemann, who practiced the system for half a century, nor his true disciples, have ever resorted to these injurious and very questionable expedients, even in incurable disorders, by which some of our brethren would seem determined to arraign "an art," as Hahnemann humbly avows, "which has never pretended to have in its power *directly* to act upon ORGANIC defects"; and we have yet to learn that allopathic measures can act *curatively* in ORGANIC transformations when Homœopathy has failed. We further hold that if these proceedings be once acknowledged as legitimate and pure practice, ere long a *spurious* system will spring up, under the name of Homœopathy, which must eventually lead to the destruction of the latter as such. The mischief already done, even during the brief period that these proceedings have found advocates, fully justifies our apprehensions. The means which are understood under the name of "auxiliaries" by their advocates, have no reference whatever to those mechanical, chemical, and similar measures, which peculiar circumstances, sudden emergencies, or external injuries may render necessary, and to which no man in his senses would object. We have here two totally different questions, which the "auxiliaries" should not be allowed to mix up for their own purposes.

Hahnemann, who, in his far-seeing sagacity, anticipated and provided for such exigencies, as will be seen by reference to his *Organon*, particularly the note and footnote appended to § 67, had also—as the Institute will have—to combat against.

"The new sect that mixes the two systems, which appeals, though in vain, to the foregoing illustrations, in order that they may have an excuse for encountering everywhere such exceptions to the general rule in diseases, and to justify their convenient employment of allopathic palliatives, and of other injurious allopathic trash besides, solely for the sake of sparing themselves the trouble of seeking for the suitable homœopathic remedy for each case of disease—I might almost say, for the sake of sparing themselves the trouble of being homœopathic physicians, and yet wishing to appear as such. But their performances are on a par with the system they pursue; they are nothing to boast of."

It is to be hoped that all those who can

conscientiously subscribe to the aforesaid scientific principles and following rules, will hasten to join the INSTITUTE, and aid thereby, in protecting Homœopathy from un-qualified persons, and also in bringing to a definite arrangement all differences of practical importance.

The "British Institute of Homœopathy," although composed of professional members exclusively, may be made to perform the functions of a most powerful association, for the dissemination of Homœopathy through the length and breadth of the land by every legitimate and honorable means. It ought to have an especial care over homœopathic literature, and if possible it should have a journal of its own to uphold and propagate its principles. The working of the Institute will be a matter of detail, but its organization should be of the simplest kind. This rough sketch is only meant to show upon what principles and in what spirit we consider the proposed Institute should be formed, in order to produce harmony among true homœopaths, and systematically to promote the interests of true Homœopathy in this country.

We request such of our homœopathic brethren as approve of these principles, and who wish to join the "Institute," to signify their intentions to one of the undersigned, not later than the 15th of November, 1853, when the members shall be called upon to name a committee of three, for the purpose of putting into proper form the principles professed by the Institute, and proposing rules and regulations which may be deemed necessary in addition to those now embodied and considered essential. A rough copy of the proceedings of this committee is then to be sent to all the members for approval and emendation. We fervently hope that our call will be responded to by all who from conviction can join us upon the principles laid down. If such, and *only such* homœopaths keep and act together, there is every reason to hope that ere long the British Institute of Homœopathy will acquire the character and privileges of a chartered Institution whereby *legally* to test the education of homœopathic practitioners. The influential portion of the public will soon see the correctness of the principles set forth, and when called upon in due time to assist in obtaining a charter, their zeal and aid will not be found wanting. We cannot conclude without expressing a confident hope that many of the non-professional public, who have the triumph of Homœopathy at heart, will assist by pecuniary contributions which will be required to carry out the undertakings of the Institute.

We are, Sir,

Your obedient servants,

CHARLES W. LUTHER, M. D. (London).

WILLIAM V. DRURY, M. D. (London).

WILLIAM L. MORGAN, M. D. (Plymouth).

DAVID WILSON, M. R. C. S. Ed. (London).

The above from the *Times*, may be read and studied profitably on this side of the Atlantic, for the homœopathic school in this country is disgraced by a class of hybrids, who seek to take rank in full communion with the disciples of Hahnemann, but whose true place would be among those of Galen. We rejoice to know that the British homœopaths are awaking to the principles and practice of Hahnemann, and it would, we think, do no harm, to let the public know that the *British Journal of Homœopathy* is leaning too much towards Allopathy.

Propagation of Homœopathy through a Homœopathic Tract Society.

To the Editor of the *Homœopathic Times*.

SIR,—Before I enter into the details of the plan which I am going to propose, I think it necessary to make a few preliminary remarks. We are in the habit of congratulating each other and our friends on every possible occasion, with a complacency worthy of the celestials, on the rapid and extensive progress of Homœopathy in this country. Unfortunately, we seem to forget, in these self-laudations, that "rapid" and "extensive" are words of relative meaning, according to the standard of comparison which is adopted; and what you and I may call gloriously rapid and extensive, others may consider ridiculously slow and confined. Now, with regard to the progress of Homœopathy in this country, *if you take into consideration for one moment the absolute truth of the science, and its undoubted practical value as a system of medicine*, you will agree with me, that so far from having reason to be in exuberant spirits, we ought to be ashamed that so little advance has been made both among the public and the profession.

It is now about a quarter of a century since Homœopathy was first introduced into England; and to what extent has it spread among the public and the medical profession? Have we succeeded, after this considerable lapse of time, in creating anything like a public opinion in regard to Homœopathy at all commensurate in extent and weight with the unspeakable importance of the subject? Are not our friends among the public comparatively "few and far between," and lost to almost all intents and purposes among the millions of non-adherents? And what are 150 practitioners more or less homœopathic among the 12,000 medical practitioners of England? what are five or six homœopaths among the 2000 allopaths in Ireland, and eleven

among the 2000 of Scotland? Is this as it ought to be? Ought not the proportions by rights to be reversed, after nearly thirty years of untroubled existence in a country where neither monopoly nor privilege unduly interfere with the free and full development of science and art?

Homœopathy is either wholly true or only partially so. If the latter be the case, as some of our wiseacres assert it is, the more modestly we behave the better; and instead of sputtering and blustering, we ought to resign ourselves uncomplainingly to our then inevitable fate, namely, that of forming the *specific tail end of the medical profession*. But if Homœopathy is wholly true, as sixty years of ample experience of the best among us has proved it to be, then, in the name of humanity, let us do something to advance it in right good earnest. Hitherto Homœopathy has been obliged to take care not only of itself, but also of those whose bounden duty it would have been, even as a small return for the rich favors it has bestowed upon them, to protect and advance it to the very utmost of their power. The great question of propagation has been left very much to the tender mercies of chance, speculation, and imperfect individual efforts, and has dwindled, under the blighting influence of the "everybody for himself and God for us all" principle, into a weak and unhealthy plant, which a few more "Congresses" will kill altogether. Yet of the many countries I have seen, I have never found one, America excepted, where the inhabitants are so ready and able to adopt Homœopathy upon rational grounds, as in England. Then what can be the cause of its comparatively insignificant progress in Great Britain, both among the professional and non-professional public?

I have considered the subject a good deal, with a view to find some adequate remedy, and have come to the conclusion that the main cause is *the gross ignorance of the public at large with regard to Homœopathy, and the want of clear and precise ideas upon the subject among our friends, and that this ignorance and want of clearness arise from the measures adopted for the propagation of Homœopathy having never been organized so systematically and on so extensive a scale as to lead to results worthy of Hahnemann's system*. You and every sensible person who knows anything of the history of Homœopathy, will undoubtedly agree with me, that if we wish extensively to propagate and solidly to establish our doctrine, we must lean upon the intelligent portion of the public almost exclusively, and that he must be verdant indeed who expects anything for our cause from the medical profession. But unless you impart to the public clear and precise ideas on the principles and merits of Homœopathy, and at the same time enable

them to compare these to Allopathy, so as to carry deep conviction of the superiority of the former into their very flesh and blood, you will always have a homœopathic public more or less uncertain, and not to be relied upon, and will perhaps never arrive at a public opinion sufficiently compact and powerful to act as a "pressure from without" upon the medical profession. Now, I ask you how many of your non-professional friends do you know, who, when asked questions about Homœopathy, are able to give clear and pertinent answers. If you have never done so, try the experiment, and you will find, to your astonishment, that even those whom you thought well acquainted with its principles, have little more than confused notions on the subject. And not only have we been neglectful in systematically enlightening, but we have done many things to stagger and perplex the public with regard to Homœopathy. Among the latter, none has been more effectual than our "Homœopathic Guides to Domestic Practice." Right to a certain degree in principle, but at all times precarious engines of propagation, they have hitherto been so injudiciously executed, that they have greatly retarded instead of advancing our cause, by leading non-professional persons to the very natural belief that when unsuccessful under the guidance of these books, Homœopathy, and not they and their advisers, are at fault. This dubious sort of literature, which renders Homœopathy simply ridiculous and contemptible in the eyes of the scientific portion of the allopathic profession, has now reached such an extent that it is high time it should be repressed into its legitimate limits, if we care for solid and healthy progress of Homœopathy in public opinion.

Another cause of our very limited progress among the professional and non-professional public, is the great discovery which some of our wise men have made for some time past, of the insufficiency of Homœopathy. Efforts are being made on all sides, and through all kinds of channels, to proclaim to the public and the medical profession that "*Homœopathy alone is insufficient, is in its infancy, and cannot do without allopathic auxiliaries*". That this comfortable doctrine finds so many adherents among the homœopaths is not astonishing, for it secures all the advantages which the open profession of Homœopathy affords, supersedes the necessity of hard study, obviates the labor and difficulties which are ever inseparable from the genuine practice of Homœopathy, and gives, besides, an odor of liberality which is pleasing to the multitude. Without entering more fully into the subject, it must strike everybody, who is in the least acquainted with the history of our system, as very suspicious, that Homœopathy should have been sufficient for half a century, in

the hands of Hahnemann and his best disciples, and that now suddenly a certain number of gentlemen, most of them very young in the practice of our doctrine, should have made the astounding discovery that homœopathic science and art, and not they themselves, are insufficient or in their infancy, and cannot do without allopathic auxiliaries. I leave you to judge whether this is calculated to propagate Homœopathy and secure unwavering friends. If this tendency is allowed to go on unchecked, ere long Homœopathy will simply become the specifiest tail of Allopathy, only rather longer than it was before Hahnemann.

I could point out other causes, *not* beyond our control, which have retarded and confined the progress of Homœopathy in Great Britain, but I must not trespass any more on your valuable space. In your next number I shall, with your permission, endeavor to show that Homœopathy may be propagated by sounder and more effective means than have been adopted hitherto, and that a *Homœopathic Tract Society* would be among the most important.

Faithfully yours,

CHARLES LUTHER.

Aug. 29, 1853.

WE do not lay before our readers the communication of Dr. LUTHER for the purpose of urging the formation of a Tract Society in our country, although to this we would not object; but our object is, to direct the attention of homœopaths to the clearly expressed, and most important facts which the article contains.—[Ed. *American Jour. Hom.*]

FURTHER CONGRESS REVELATIONS.

UNDER the above heading an energetic correspondent has forwarded a communication, written no doubt under impulsive feelings, which he would regret to see reproduced in our columns, upbraiding us for withholding from our wide circle of readers some "interesting particulars" in our report of the Congress of Homœopathic Practitioners, held at Manchester, last August; "An offence," he says, "that has also been committed by the *British Journal of Homœopathy*." Our correspondent sends us the *Provincial Homœopathic Gazette*, being the *third* copy with which we have been favored, in which the proceedings seem to have been published, *con amore*, more in detail than we thought necessary at the time. As our attention has been thus again directed to some points of untenable practice, as we think, we hasten to make the *amende* for a seemingly wilful

omission, assuring our correspondent that he must have sadly mistaken the character of our past efforts and disapproval of proceedings tending to disseminate, we believe, most dangerous practical doctrines on the question of the dose and the manner of conducting homœopathic practice, which the writer of these observations hesitates not to denounce as the most arrant system of charlatany and cheat that was ever palmed upon a credulous public, in connection with a highly refined and philosophic system of practical medicine. We are somewhat surprised that Dr. R. Russell, of Leamington, should have ventured to go out of his way and depth, to break a lance with the acute reasoner Dr. Epps, to whom we accord our sincere sentiments of respect, for his bold and faithful, as well as successful defence of our departed Master. We think if Dr. Epps, and such as he, were to show themselves a little more frequently amongst such crude gatherings, a real service to our cause, and humanity, would be rendered, for which he and others would deserve everlasting gratitude. We do not pretend to say that we concur without trifling dissent to some of Dr. Epps's propositions, but, in the main, we join him heart and soul in his views, in reference to the gross and heinous injustice that is being enunciated as the practice of Hahnemann. Dr. Epps was very ably and truthfully supported by Dr. Pearce, of Northampton, who was, we think, most lenient in the excuse he suggested as a screen for a few practitioners' deficient memory,—when it would have been more near the truth had he charged such practitioners with unpardonable ignorance of Hahnemann's writings. As to those gentlemen who pride themselves on having effected cures with tinctures, when other preparations of the same medicine have failed, we have challenged them, and again challenge them, to report in our columns such cases for our instruction.

We only seek truth and instruction, and if the means of acquiring such be denied unto us, we must place greater reliance on the wisdom of Hahnemann, who practised with such success for half a century, and which has been confirmed by his true and faithful disciples, than we can repose in the mere assertion of men who seem to glory in hearing themselves talk, after the manner of allopathic generalizers.

The principal speakers shall now be allowed to come on the stage, and the public can judge of their performance and our critic.

After Dr. Epps had given a brief sketch of the introduction of Homœopathy into Manchester—*first*, through Dr. Belluomini being summoned thither to attend the exhausted Malibran; *secondly*, through his own lectures there; and *lastly*, the

residence of Dr. David—he added (and we wonder where Mr. Phillips was upon the utterance of this terrible onslaught!):

“It now just twelve years since Homœopathy was thus introduced into Manchester, and what do I find? I find, that with a population of 350,000 people, there are only *six* homœopathic practitioners. When I regard the wonderful power which Homœopathy puts in the hands of those who practice it truly—when I consider that anything that is productive of good is sure soon to spread through a city peculiarly circumstanced as in Manchester—and when I take the fact that, after twelve years’ homœopathic existence, Manchester occupies no more than six practitioners—I feel that there is something wrong in connection with Homœopathy in this city. I have no hesitation in asserting, that these facts show a lamentable slowness of progress in Manchester. I seek for the causes, and I think one is the fact that the successors to Dr. David have given up *globules* and have had recourse to *tinctures*.”

“Dr. Epps then referred to some prescriptions said to have been written at the Homœopathic Hospital in Manchester: ‘If such be the homœopathic practice of Manchester, I do not wonder at the non-diffusion of Homœopathy in the city. And I will take the liberty of declaring what I have so often declared elsewhere, that he who attempts to make up by quantity of medicine the deficiency existing from his want of selection of quality, exhibits a lamentable ignorance of the labors of Hahnemann; exhibits a want of moral courage, in trying to induce a belief that he does something because he gives medicines in quantities that people can sensually recognize them.’”

“Dr. Epps concluded by remarking, that had he followed his natural inclinations he would have remained away from the Congress, and avoid declaring the facts and the opinions to which he had now given utterance, but having had so much to do with Manchester, he felt bound to use the present occasion to protest as he did against the present appearance of Homœopathy in Manchester, and to look back for the spirit that actuated his dear friend Dr. David, the first practitioner who settled in Manchester.”

“Dr. Russell then rose and said: He disapproved of public lectures, and especially popular lectures. He for one thought that it did not become a physician to appear on a public platform and attempt to teach medical truths to popular minds. He did not think the public were capable of judging of such matters, nor did he think it creditable to travel from one town to another and take advantage of a circumstance to give a popular lecture. There was not only a danger of misleading the public, but there was also a danger of a lecturer being himself carried away by the

impulse of the moment into subjects and topics foreign to the objects of a physician, Mr. Holland had no doubt that the Manchester practitioners were as successful as those who complained of them, and who professed to adopt the almost exclusive use of globules. Dr. Ramsbotham also maintained that the success of tinctures justified their frequent use; that cures had occurred in his own practice, which, failing under globule administration, subsequently succeeded when tinctures were had recourse to.

“Dr. Sharp and others attempted to show that the dose was quite of secondary importance, and was yet to be ascertained and decided on by experiments. That the founder of Homœopathy, when he had developed the fundamental law of *similia*, gave no directions as to the actual dose to be employed.

“Dr. Epps then rose to reply to the remarks that had been made by the various members who had spoken:

“Mr. Chairman, the remarks of Dr. Russell have had a strong bearing. He has deprecated what he has designated ‘Travelling Lecturers,’ lecturing to the public on Homœopathy. He has represented it as rather *infra dig.*, as a kind of intrusion into the domains of other practitioners; as tending to create a distrust in the public mind of the practitioners resident where the lectures are delivered; as being not, on the whole, advantageous to the profession. Now, Sir, I beg most decidedly to differ from Dr. Russell; the travelling lecturer is the best pioneer. He is the individual who, in the shortest possible time, gives to the public mind a knowledge of the bearing of the subject on which he lectures. The travelling lecturer is the great agent for developing a truth; he is the seed-sower. Dr. Russell seems to despise the travelling lecturer, and I do not know where Christianity would have been had it not been for the twelve travelling lecturers which He, who trod and blessed this earth nearly two thousand years ago, sent forth. According to Dr. Russell, the fishermen of Galilee were mis-sent. They were travelling lecturers; indeed, the command was, ‘Go, and preach the good tidings to every creature.’”

“Sir, there is something in the lecture that the other agencies for distribution cannot supply. Our worthy fellow-laborer, Mr. Sharp, has been a travelling lecturer—travelling by means of the printing press to the public. He has published some interesting pamphlets on Homœopathy. He has travelled popularly, and we applaud him, but he travels only by *print*; he appeals to popular audiences by the *eye*; but when the traveller, carrying the homœopathic truth, travels and appeals to the *ear* as well as to the *eye*, then he becomes a cause of offence to our worthy

friend, Dr. Russell. But does not every one know that a fact embodied in a picture produces a tenfold greater effect than the mere fact recorded in print? And why is this? Simply because such picture, by appealing to the eye, brings the fact more vividly before the mind. Does not every one know the power of the dramatic performance? Does not every one feel, when he sees a Macready acting the part of Othello, that jealousy has its evil immovably engraved on his mind? And why should Dr. Russell salute with "God speed" the homœopathic truth, when appealing through the printing press to the popular mind—which mode of appeal is by its very nature limited to the one reader at a time—and yet when the popular lecturer brings the same truth before the minds of hundreds at one time, and conveys the truth with all the force that vocal utterance, and it may be eloquence, may impart, he is to be designated by the special phrase "Travelling Lecturer?" Why, Dr. Russell himself is highly delighted when he can get a travelling lecturer to spread his fame. How does Dr. Russell extend his practice? He happens to cure some patient; that patient becomes Dr. Russell's travelling lecturer. He lectures to all persons similarly afflicted as he was (and it is astonishing how such people know each other), and tells them, "Go to Dr. Russell, he cured me of a complaint exactly like yours, after Allopathy had tried its best in vain." Let me ask Dr. Russell, does he approve of such travelling lecturer? But, Sir, I maintain that the popular lecture is the best mode of spreading Homœopathy. I recommend every practitioner practising Homœopathy to lecture in the town where he resides; he will do more for Homœopathy in one month by so doing, than he would effect in a year without, *i. e.*, provided he *practises* Homœopathy in its purity; if not, let not his lips profane the great truth.

"It is said the popular lecturer appeals to an audience not qualified to judge. This is not the case; even Dr. Russell acknowledges this, when he does not repudiate his cured patient's lecture to some person whom he tries to persuade to consult Dr. Russell. The popular lecturer gives the public the materials to judge between differing systems of treatment. He does not induce the interference with the mode of practice when once adopted. It is just like the parent, who, before he decides to intrust his child to a given schoolmaster, examines the modes of tuition adopted at different schools, and having selected the best, he sends his child to the school selected, and there ends his interference; he meddles not with the details by which the schoolmaster, approved of after inquiry, carries out his plans.

"Mr. Holland, I think, remarked that it would be well if Dr. Epps applied the

besom to the London practitioners who used large doses: I do do this. Whenever these large doses are proclaimed and advocated by the members of the Homœopathic Medical Society, I always oppose the practice: I do there what I have done here. Mr. Holland, I think, referred to the success which attended the practice of those who give these large doses; but this does not prove that their practice could not have been much more successful had these gentlemen adhered to what Hahnemann taught; indeed, all that is proved is this—that Homœopathy has such utility, that it outlives the injuries done in its name. The success depends on the mighty power of Homœopathy; indeed, a tyro with Homœopathy is more powerful to cure in many diseases than is the best-taught allopathic physician.

"Our worthy colleague, Dr. Sharp, has tried to meet the difficulty of the dose by stating that differences are to be allowed, because, while there is an universal law of cure, there is no universal law as to dose. It is true that the law regulating the dose has not been discovered, but because it has not been, are we to forego all that experience that Hahnemann acquired by long practice as to the dose? and because we have not this law, are we to be at liberty to dose as each one may please? almost, in so dosing, virtually throwing into oblivion the fact that the medicinal virtues of bodies are actually developed by the process of trituration and dilution. What practitioner could justify himself in giving a grain of *Silicea*? And why not, if dose is of no moment? He would reply, it is certain that the additional trituration of *Silicea*, in higher potencies, develops the virtues of *Silicea* not to be found developed in the 1st trituration. Why should this not apply to all other medicines in their more advanced developments?"

"One gentleman remarked that in the only cases recorded by Hahnemann, of his own at least, which have become public, tinctures were employed. Dr. Luther explained that only one or two cases had appeared before the public, because Madame Hahnemann still possessed an immense amount of manuscript which she refused either to publish herself or dispose of to others.

"Dr. Pearce could not help intruding one remark. It had been said, and he regretted to hear it, because it betrayed a want of memory on the part of those who said it, that Hahnemann gave no directions as to the dose. If he did not mistake, Hahnemann, in his *Materia Medica*, distinctly mentions, in the introduction to each medicine of which the pathogenetic symptoms are given, the dose to be administered of the medicine. Here he says one globule of the decillionth. In another case, one globule of the 30th dilution, and

so on. In studying the *Materia Medica*, it had certainly struck him (Dr. Pearce) that there were ample directions laid down to guide us, as well for the dose as for the remedy. He could not help regretting, if our homœopathic hospitals are to be considered as schools for the rising generation of practitioners, that no opportunity is given to the student to ascertain by experience the virtues of the doses of Hahnemann. He said this because, in a visit to the Manchester Homœopathic Hospital that very morning, he had discovered, to his utter astonishment, that tinctures were the rule, and not the exception. Indeed, in looking at the stock of medicines in the dispensary connected with the hospital, he was surprised to find only a few phials of globules; and on making remark to the house surgeon, that gentleman replied that we *always* use tinctures. Dr. Pearce added, that the further he advanced in the practice of Homœopathy, he found the greatest difficulty was to find a dose sufficiently minute when the remedy was homœopathically chosen; and, with regard to the dilutions, he could no more dispense with the high potencies, now that he had proved the virtues of the 200th and higher, than he could the 3rd, 6th, or 12th.

"Mr. Gillow related a case of diarrhœa, which presenting the symptoms of *Arsenic*, he gave that medicine in globules of various potencies, but got no good effect; and that grain-doses of the 1st trituration very soon cured the patient.

"Dr. Epps again rose and said—'The objection is not against the use of tinctures in certain cases; it is against the employment of tinctures as the rule in diseases, not their employment as the exception to the rule. He added: 'My belief is that the tincture-givers create many diseased states by the tinctures they give. If they cure the diseases for which they give their tinctures they create medicinal diseases; and I have noticed in the patients of those who give tinctures, that there is a peculiar nervous excitability, which I ascribe to the injurious super-effects of the medicines administered. And this leads me to notice the cure, as referred to by Mr. Gillow, that when the patient who had taken *Arsenicum* in globules impregnated with the higher dilutions, and was uncured, was cured by *Arsenic* in the dose of one grain of the 1st trituration, the query suggests itself—was the patient cured? was not some diseased state induced by the *Arsenic*, which suspended the other diseased state? Indeed, I should not at all wonder if Mr. Gillow does find his patient drop suddenly dead. It is not unlikely that the diseased action induced in the stomach by the *Arsenic* has suspended the diseased action that previously existed in the bowels.

"Let gentlemen use the medicines in the doses that Hahnemann recommended,

and in the diseased states to which they are homœopathically applicable, and then, if they do not succeed, let them try another dose. What, Sir, is our state? We are crying out about our want of experience respecting the dose, our want of certainty, and yet in the same breath we repudiate the experience collected by the father of our system; such persons ignore what Hahnemann taught, and dignify their ignorance by calling it a doubt.'—*Hom. Times*.

Complaint of the Edinburgh Allopaths to Æsculapius.

To be sung at the next meeting* of the Medico-Chirurgical Society.

Arouse thee, Æsculapius!
Defend our ancient craft,
Our enemies have pierced us
With many a poisoned shaft,
We know not who the next may be
To swallow Homœopathy.

Thou knowest we have been faithful
To thee, our sovereign lord,
And many a pill and bolus,
We down men's throats have poured.
We know indeed that some have died,
But then, we knew not—till we tried.

Our ancient craft's in danger—
Oh! help us in our need;
Let no heretic stranger
Deprive us of our creed.
Let Physic be our watchword still;
Still let our motto be a Pill.

For drugs they would abolish—
Drugs that have stood the test;
Our mortars they'd demolish,
Our lancets set at rest:
Ignore the use of taste and smell,
And with a globule make us well.

Oh, help us, Æsculapius!
For, if defeated now,
Before this dread similibus
We'll be constrained to bow:
The louder we abuse and curse,
Lanker and lighter grows our purse.

Our noble champion preserve—
Oh! may he never leave us,
Desert the cause he's sworn to serve,
Or wickedly deceive us.
For much we know he hath confessed
He should have kept within his breast.

Oh, help us, Æsculapius!
To put the foe to flight:
Similia similibus,
With all our hearts, we'll fight.
For we are filled with shame and hate,
Whilst Mordecai is in the gate.

(From the *Edinburgh News*.)

We are not of those who deny the right of educated physicians to practice their art as they may judge best; but we do deny the right of any one to profess to the public the adoption of a system of medicine which is exact in its principles, and then habitually violate those principles in practice. This we believe is the case with some who profess faith in Homœopathy. Although we would not in every case charge intentional deception, yet all such are liable to be thought thus guilty. The true state of the case is this: Physicians who undertake to investigate Homœopathy, instead of thoroughly studying the system as taught by Hahnemann in his *Organon and Chronic Diseases*, seek the acquaintance of some mongrel practitioner, and from him expect the desired information, who summarily leads them into a mode of practice that is not essentially different from Allopathy, except in the form; which so chimes in with their Allopathic education, that they never feel the necessity of being "educated anew," but soon learn to speak of Hahnemann's doctrines as antiquated, and more than intimate that they are false. The true disciples of Hahnemann should not hold fellowship with these mongrels, who by their *spurious* Homœopathy retard the progress of truth and do injury to those who are suffering from disease.

EFFECT OF CLIMATE ON CONSUMPTION.

It appears that the medical faculty are beginning to question the opinion which has so long prevailed among medical men, that a change of climate is beneficial to persons suffering from consumption. Sir James Clark, of England, has assailed the doctrine with considerable force; and a French physician, named Carrière, has written against it; but its most vigorous opponent is Dr. Burgess, of Scotland. He contends that climate has little or nothing to do with the cure of consumption; and that, if it had, the curative effects would be produced through the skin, and not the lungs. That a warm climate is not in itself beneficial, he shows from the fact that the disease exists in all latitudes. In India and Africa, it is as frequent as in Europe and North America. At Malta, in the very heart of the genial Mediterranean, the army-reports of England show that one-third of the deaths among the soldiers are

by consumption. At Nice, a favorite resort of English invalids, especially those afflicted with lung-complaints, there are more native-born persons that die of consumption than in any English town of equal population. In Genoa, this disease is almost equally prevalent. In Madeira, no local disease is more common than consumption. The next position of Dr. Burgess is, that, as the beasts, birds, and fishes of one region die in another, a change of climate cannot, unless exceptionally, be beneficial to an invalid. Notwithstanding the greater adaptability to climate which man preserves, the human constitution, it is plain, cannot endure changes of temperature without being more or less affected by it. The frosts and thaws of England have corroded, during the lapse of ages, the solid stone of which their cathedrals were built. In like manner, a foreign climate gradually undermines the health. Dr. Burgess refers to the shattered constitution of every officer who has served for any length of time in India, and to the well-known fact that children born of white parents in India are delicate as a class. The African cannot endure severe and protracted cold. If such is the effect of changes of climate on persons in health, what must it be, argues Dr. Burgess, on invalids? And he fortifies this theoretical conclusion, by reminding the reader that it is not only the natives who die of consumption in Madeira, but that the grave-yards of that island are whitened by the head-stones of thousands who have gone there for health, and remained to die.

Persons not professional imagine, that the consumptive patient by breathing a mild atmosphere, withdraws irritation, and leaves nature free to work a cure. But this notion Dr. Burgess characterizes as entirely erroneous. It is through the skin, not through the lungs, he contends, that a warm climate acts beneficially. When a sudden change in the temperature produces a chill, cutaneous perspiration is checked, the skin becomes dry and hard, and the lungs suffer from excessive action; for they are compelled now to eliminate what should have passed off through the skin. The doctor illustrates this by referring to the instantaneous relief which is generally obtained through free perspiration, where difficult breathing or oppression of the chest has been occasioned by artificial heat. What is best for consumptives, therefore, is an equable climate. It is the fluctuations, not the high temperature, of a climate that is injurious.